Page 9

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given

the present application.

Claims 4-20 are now present in this application. Claims 4, 14 and 19

are independent.

Amendments have been made to the Title of the Invention and Abstract

of the Disclosure, claims 1-3 have been canceled, claims 14-20 have been

added, and claims 4 and 6-13 have been amended. Claims 9-13 stand

withdrawn pursuant to an election of species requirement. Reconsideration of

this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

I. Priority Under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging Applicant's claim for

foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of the certified priority

documents.

II. Information Disclosure Citation

Applicant is concurrently filing an Information Disclosure Statement for

consideration by the Examiner.

Page 10

III. Drawings

Applicant has not received a Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing

Review PTO-948 indicating whether or not the formal drawings have been

approved by the Draftsperson. Since no objection has been received, Applicant

assumes that the drawings are acceptable and that no further action is

necessary. Confirmation thereof in the next Office Action is respectfully

requested.

IV. Restriction Requirement

The Examiner has made the Restriction Requirement final, and has

withdrawn claims 1-3 from further consideration. By this Amendment, Applicant

has canceled non-elected claims 1-3. Applicants reserve the right to file a

divisional application directed to claims 1-3 at a later date if so desired.

V. Election of Species Requirement

The Examiner has made the Election of Species Requirement final, and

has withdrawn claims 9-13 from further consideration. Applicant has not

canceled these non-elected claims since each of these claims depends, either

directly or indirectly, from independent generic claim 4, which is believed to be

allowable. Upon allowance of independent claim 4, Applicant respectfully

Application No.: 10/060,205

Art Unit 2834

060,205 Attorney Docket No. 0630-1423P

Amendment filed May 4, 2004

Page 11

requests examination and allowance of these withdrawn claims.

VI. Title of the Invention

Applicant has amended the Title of the Invention in order to better reflect

the subject matter claimed.

VII. Abstract of the Disclosure

Applicant has amended the Abstract of the Disclosure in order to place it

in better form.

VIII. Claim Amendments

Applicant has amended the claims in order to correct minor

typographical errors, and to place the claims in better form. The claim

amendments are not being made in response to any statutory requirement for

patentability, and have not been narrowed in scope. Instead, the claims have

been amended merely to recite the subject matter therein more clearly.

IX. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph

Claims 4-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph. This

rejection is respectfully traversed.

Application No.: 10/060,205 Attorney Docket No. 0630-1423P

Art Unit 2834 Amendment filed May 4, 2004

Page 12

The Examiner has set forth certain instances wherein the claim language

is not clearly understood.

In order to overcome this rejection, Applicant has amended claims 4 and

7 to correct each of the deficiencies specifically pointed out by the Examiner.

Applicant respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, particularly point

out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the

invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are

respectfully requested.

X. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by

Bertocchi et al. Further, claims 4, 5 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §

102(b) as being anticipated by Kloster et al. These rejections are respectfully

traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the

Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but

merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicant respectfully

submits that independent claim 4 has been amended to recite a combination of

elements in a core lamination structure including coupling means which are

formed on each of the respective lamination sheets so as to be connected

Page 13

together in a row with adjacent lamination sheets. Applicant respectfully

submits that this combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 4 is

not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Bertocchi et

al. and Kloster et al.

With regard to claim 4, Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant claims

that the respective lamination sheets are "fixedly coupled together by coupling

means." The language utilized in claim 4 is specifically permitted as set forth in

35 U.S.C. Sec. 112, sixth paragraph.

Applicant submits that Bertocchi et al. does not disclose the claimed

"coupling means". The Examiner consider fixing means as coupling clips (3) &

cavities(6). However, lines 12-13 of column 3 in Bertocchi et al. state that "[t]he

coupling cavities 6 are arranged to house the clips 3 of the adjacent lamination."

Also, lines 25-27 of column 3 recite that "[t]hey (clips and cavities) could however

also be shaped as a recessed female element, for housing the projection portion

of the clips 3." That is, coupled clips (3) are just "housed" (not fixedly coupled) in

cavities (6). In other words, Bertocchi et al. discloses a freely engaging relation so

that the lamination sheets are rotated through an angle B in Fig. 2.

Applicant respectfully submits that the freely engaging relationship of the

coupling clips of Bertocchi et al. is not equivalent to the "fixedly coupled"

arrangement in the claimed invention, and therefore claim 4 is not anticipated by

Bertocchi et al.

Page 14

With regard to Kloster et al., Applicant submits that it is incorrect for the Examiner to consider the caulking segment (8) and the complimentary opening (9) of a slightly larger dimension to constitute the claimed "coupling means". The Examiner's attention is directed to column 2 lines 39-44 of Kloster et al., which discloses that the complementary openings are of a preselected slightly larger dimensional size and compatible configuration to nestingly receive the lamination displaced segments of an adjacent lamination in selectively spaced unconstrained aligned relationship. In addition, lines 5-9 of column 5 state that "[t]he stator assembly is then annealed with the nesting displaced segments 8 slightly spaced from compatible openings 9 in adjacent laminations so as to minimize frictionally engaging contact and concomitant core losses." In other words, the recesses are sized larger than projections to avoid frictional engagement. In Kloster et al. they are in nesting relation, not fixedly coupled. However, in Applicant's claimed invention, the lamination sheets are fixedly coupled by "coupling means".

Applicant respectfully submits that the relationship of the segments and openings of Kloster et al. is not equivalent to the "fixedly coupled" arrangement in the claimed invention, and therefore claim 4 is not anticipated by Kloster et al.

In summary, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 4 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Bertocchi et al. and Kloster et al., for the Application No.: 10/060,205 Attorney Docket No. 0630-1423P Art Unit 2834

Amendment filed May 4, 2004

Page 15

reasons explained above. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this

rejection are respectfully requested.

With regard to dependent claims 5 and 8, Applicant submits that claims 5

and 8 depend directly from independent claim 4 which is allowable for the

reasons set forth above, and therefore claims 5 and 8 are allowable based on

their dependence from claim 4.

In addition, with regard to claim 5, contrary to the Examiner's assertions at

page 4-5 of the Office Action, Kloster et al. does not disclose or suggest "the

respective lamination sheets are fixedly coupled by caulking successively and

sequentially," as recited in pending claim 5. In Kloster et al., as set forth in lines

52-57 of column 3, "each stator lamination can be provided at each of the four

corners thereof with one of four spaced bolt holes 7, holes 7 serving to receiving

through-bolts for fastening outer bearing support end caps-all as known in the

art and therefore not shown." However, the caulking is to make fastening by

filling or sealing, and therefore Kloster's invention is not fixed by caulking but

bolted together through holes 7 & end caps.

Still further, with regard to claim 8, the coupling means fixedly couple the

laminated body by the engaging of the coupling portion on the respective

lamination sheets. However, as explained above, Kloster et al. discloses that the

lamination sheets are bolted together.

Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Application No.: 10/060,205 Attorney Docket No. 0630-1423P

Art Unit 2834 Amendment filed May 4, 2004

Page 16

XI. Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner states that claim 6 would be allowable if rewritten in

independent form, and that claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten or amended

to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the early indication of allowable subject

matter in this application. Claims 7 has been amended as set forth above in

order to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph. In

addition, new claim 19 has been added which includes the subject matter of

allowable claim 6 rewritten into independent form. Claim 20 has been added to

depend from claim 19, and which includes the subject matter of amended

allowable claim 7.

Consideration and allowance of claims 19 and 20 are respectfully

requested.

XII. Claims 14-20

Claims 14-20 have been added for the Examiner's consideration which are

readable on the elected species. Claim 19 and 20 have been discussed above.

Claims 14-18 do not recite any new matter, because the original

disclosure, in particular, Figs. 6-13, fully supports the recited features.

Independent claim 14 recites a combination of elements in a lamination

Attorney Docket No. 0630-1423P

Amendment filed May 4, 2004

Page 17

sheet including a coupling portion specifically configured to allow caulking of a

plurality of lamination sheets in a first direction and caulking in a second

direction different from the first direction. Applicant respectfully submits that

this combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 14 is not

disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, which fails to show or

suggest a coupling portion which allows caulking of a plurality of lamination

sheets in a first direction and caulking in a second direction different from the

first direction.

Applicant submits that claims 15-18 depend, either directly or indirectly,

from independent claim 14, and are therefore allowable based on their

dependence from claim 14 which is believed to be allowable. In addition, claims

15-18 recite further limitations which are not disclosed or made obvious by the

applied prior art references.

Application No.: 10/060,205

Art Unit 2834

Consideration and allowance of claims 14-20 are respectfully requested.

XIII. Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed,

accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that

the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be

withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the

outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition

Application No.: 10/060,205

Art Unit 2834

Attorney Docket No. 0630-1423P Amendment filed May 4, 2004

Page 18

for allowance. Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is

respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will

expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone

James T. Eller, Jr., Registration No. 39,538, at (703) 205-8000, in the

Washington, D.C. area.

Applicants respectfully petition under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §

1.136(a) and § 1.17 for a two (2) month(s) extension of time in which to respond

to the Examiner's Office Action. The Extension of Time Fee in the amount of

**\$420.00** is attached hereto.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent,

and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit

Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or

1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By:

James T. Eller, Jr.

R**e**g. No.: 39,538

JTE:mmi

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

Telephone: (703)205-8000